DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 218 CG 012 955

AUTHOR Zingraff, Matthew T.
TITLE Prisonization: A Comparison of Male and Female Delinquents.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (72nd, Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977); Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Corrective Institutions; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Disadvantaged Environment; Females; *Institutionalized Persons; Males; Prisoners; Research Projects; Social Environment; Social Influences; *Socialization
IDENTIFIERS *Prisonization

ABSTRACT

Two general explanatory models have been proposed to account for the emergence and quality of the inmate subculture. The deprivation model focuses upon the notion that correctional institutions are based upon coercion and that the institutional experience degrades and deprives the inmate. The inmates' adaptive response to these structurally-generated problems is to create a new normative order; one which provides the inmate with social status in an otherwise status-depriving situation. The importation model argues, in contrast, that the inmate subculture is a product of prior socialization and experiences. This research assesses the relative explanatory power of each theoretical model as a predictor of inmate adaptations to confinement. Data were gathered from two institutions for juveniles, one male and one female. The findings indicated that the deprivation model of imprisonment was the better predictor of prisonization for males. However, such a clear-cut distinction between the explanatory power of each model was not evidenced for the female population. It was suggested that these differences between the male and female samples were a result of the varying levels of coercive force utilized in the two settings. (Author)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED158218

# PRISONIZATION: A COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE DELINQUENTS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

by

Matthew T. Zingraff
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
North Carolina State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M.T. Zingraff
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, 1977

CG012955

PRISONIZATION: A COMPARISON OF MALE

AND FEMALE DELINQUENTS

Prisonization research prior to the late 1950's (cf., Sykes, 1958) was exploratory, descriptive, and not guided by any particular theoretical model or design. Since then two general theoretical perspectives have emerged as explanations of prisonization: the deprivation and importation models of imprisonment. The deprivation model places the primary emphasis upon intrainstitutional pressures and problems generated by imprisonment itself. On the other hand, the importation model stresses the importance of pre-institutional variables. Recent attempts have been made to empirically access the relative explanatory power of each theoretical position (cf., Schwartz, 1973; Akers et al., 1974; Thomas, 1977).

The purpose of the present research is two-fold. First, relevant variables from both theoretical perspectives will be utilized in an attempt to ascertain which set of variables, is the better predictor of prisonization. The second issue concerns the applicability of the two models themselves to the study of adaptation patterns in juvenile correctional facilities. Most empirical research to date has utilized maximum-security, adult, male correctional institutions for convicted felons as a data base. Consequently, the bases for both the deprivation and importation models derive from these samples. A few exceptions notwithstanding (cf., Schwartz, 1971, 1973), the utility of employing these two models in an analysis of juvenile correctional institutions remains problematic. Furthermore, the existing female corrections

literature suggests gross differences between male and female adaptations to confinement. The present research asserts that these "gross differences" have been suggested but not empirically demonstrated.

Relevant Research

How inmates adapt to confinement is certainly not a new issue confronting criminologists. At the very least it is nearing the end of its fourth decade of study (cf., Reimer, 1939; Hayner and Ash, 1940; Clemmer, 1940; Schrag, 1944). Not surprisingly a rather voluminous amount of literature exists; too voluminous to outline in detail here. However, some of the major findings may be noted. Research focusing upon the assimilation of inmates into the inmate subculture has demonstrated that the degree of prisonization is affected by such factors as the length of time incarcerated (Clemmer, 1940, 1950; Wheeler, 1961), interpersonal ties with other inmates (Clemmer, 1940, 1950; Wheeler, 1961), the proportion of the sentence remaining to be served (Wheeler, 1961, Garabedian, 1963; Glaser, 1964; Wellford, 1967), the social role assumed by the inmate within the subculture (Schrag, 1944, 1961; Sykes, 1958; Sykes and Messinger, 1960; Cloward, 1960; Garabedian, 1963, 1964; Wellford, 1967), the degree and quality of contact with free society while incarcerated (Clemmer, 1940; Glaser, 1964; Thomas, 1973), the postrelease expectations of the inmate (Wheeler, 1961; Glaser, 1964; Thomas 1973; Zingraff, 1973, 1975), the degree of alienation (Tittle and Tittle, 1964; Thomas and Poole, 1975), Thomas and Zingraff, 1976), self concept of the inmate (Tittle, 1972a, 1972b: Faine, 1973), and type of organizational structure (Grusky, 1959; Berk, 1966; Zald, 1960, 1962; Zald and Street, 1964; Sarri and Vinter, 1964; Street, 1965; Street et al., 1966; Cline, 1968; Mathiesen, 1971).

One obvious omission in the preceding presentation of research findings is the absence of studies dealing with incarcerated female offenders. This is a major limitation in light of the fact that the present research is a comparative analysis of adaptation patterns of both male and female offenders. However, this omission reflects our overall state of knowledge in the area of female corrections. First of all, there is a paucity of empirical research on incarcerated female populations. Second, the available research is limited in both theory and method. Third, the propositions to be tested in the present research have been consistently overlooked in the research on female institutions. Fourth, the researchers in the area of female corrections have for the most part attempted to discern the differences between male and female inmates, rather than the similarities. Relatively detailed examinations of the major works in the area of female corrections research may be found elsewhere (cf., Zingraff, 1976). Suffice it to say that the number of studies is few (cf., Ward and Kassebaum, 1965; Gaillombardo, 1966, 1974; Heffernan, 1972; Jensen & Jones, 1976), and the findings presented are far from consistent.[1]

Theoretical Consideration

While there is general agreement concerning the existence of an informal inmate normative system within the correctional community, crucial questions remain concerning first, the determinants of this normative system, and second, how the tenets of this system are transmitted to subsequent populations of inmates. Two central conceptual models have been proposed to explain the content of, and allegiance to, the inmate subculture (cf., Cline, 1968).

Proponents of the "deprivation" model of imprisonment argue that the prison experience is one which deprives the inmate of both material possessions and social-psychological support mechanisms. Inmates are further degraded by the institutional control over even the most mundane activities of everyday life, i.e. when to sleep, when to wash (cf., Sykes and Messinger, 1960). As such this model proposes a functional argument in accounting for inmate reactions to these structurally-generated problems. The inmates' adaptive response to the "pains of imprisonment" is to create and maintain the inmate subculture, providing the inmate with social status and support in an otherwise status-depriving situation. The emergence of and movement into the inmate normative system is viewed as purposive and problem-solving.

The "importation" model suggests that incarcerated individuals are not devoid of prior socialization and experiences when they enter the institution (cf., Thomas, 1970.) Certainly it can be argued that certain similarities in the social backgrounds of inmates, (i.e., social class), and similarities in the composition of inmate society (i.e., disproportionate representation of minorities) should affect both the orientation of the inmate normative system and inmate identification with such a system (cf., Street, 1962: 5-10). Neither model, however, is beyond criticism. Critics of the deprivation model (cf., Thomas, 1970; Jacobs, 1974) justifiably point out that this approach does not give adequate attention to the probable impact of pre- and extra- institutional variables. Furthermore, physical isolation may not always result in social isolation. On the other hand, perhaps the most severe limitation of the importation model is that in there attempts to overcome the

omissions within the deprivation model, proponents of the importation perspective have too often oversimplified the probable impact of the institutional setting. This can best be seen in the early formulations of the importation model (cf., Irwin and Cressey, 1962). In short both models may be indicted for ignoring the probable importance of variables beyond their individual framework.

Research Methodology

At the time of the study there were 340 inmates in the population at the male institution. Of this initial pool of potential respondents, twenty inmates (5.9 percent) refused to fill out the questionnaire, six (1.8 percent were absent without official leave,)and four (1.2 percent) were in the infirmary and inaccessible. Thus 310 questionnaries were administered. Further attrition of the initial pool of respondents resulted from receiving thirty-eight questionnaries that could not be matched with the institutional records data (12.3 percent), and five were improperly completed (1.6 percent). This resulted in a final sample 267 male inmates or 78.5 percent of the total population and 86.1 percent of those who received a questionnaire.

The population at the female institution numbered 143 inmates. Sample shrinkage was due to hospitalization (2 or 1.4 percent), release to a half-way house (1 or 0.7 percent), absent without leave (1 or 0.7 percent), release to a mental institution for psychiatric observation (1 or 0.7 percent) and an improperly completed questionnaire (1 or 0.7 percent). Completed data was thus obtained from 137 female inmates (95.8 percent of the total population). All questionnaires

were matched with the institutional records. The operationalization of the major variables utilized in the analysis is described below.

Prisonization. Prisonization is conceptualized as the degree to which the inmate embraces the tenets of the inmate subculture. An eight-item Likert scale was used to measure this variable (Thomas, 1971). All scales in this research were constructed by using an item to total scale score technique. Any item whose item-to-scale score correlation was not significant at the .001 confidence level and equal to or greater than .35 for both populations was not included in the final scale. Summated scale scores and item-to-scale score correlations were recomputed when items were deleted from the final scale. Sample items and their item-to-scale score correlations are provided in the Appendix.

Societal Powerlessness. Of the various dimensions of alienation, societal powerlessness seems to be of particular relevance to a population of incarcerated individuals. Accordingly, powerlessness is conceptualized as a general feeling of helplessness and the belief that one has little control over one's destiny. A seven-item Likert scale derived from the measure reported by Neal and Rettig (1967) was used to measure this dimension of alienation.

Organizational Powerlessness. This dimension of alienation is conceptualized as a specific response to the deprivations of imprisonment. Thus, organizational powerlessness has an immediate referent in the institutional setting itself. A four-item Likert scale reported recently (Thomas and Zingraff, 1976) was used to measure this variable.

Postrelease Expectations. Proponents of the importation model[2] of imprisonment have placed considerable importance upon the degree

to which inmates have positive expectations concerning probable post-release adjustment and success. A positive anticipatory response should decrease the degree of prisonization. A twelve-item Likert scale developed by Thomas (1971) was used to operationalize this concept.

Participation in Treatment Programs. The comparative organizational literature stresses that the orientation of the inmate subculture is determined in large part by the overall goals (treatment vs. custody) of the formal organization. The literature further indicates that those inmates participating in treatment programs should evidence lower degrees of prisonization. Both institutions were introducing a new treatment program in some of the housing units at the time of the study. Three of the fourteen male cottages and three of the eight female cottages had this program. While a strict interorganizational comparison is not possible given the data at hand, it will be possible to assess the differences between the treatment groups and the traditional cottage types. The goals, perspectives, and operation of the treatment program were independent of the functioning of the rest of the institution.

Social Class of Origin. The social class of the juveniles was determinedd by their father's (or guardian's) occupational ranking reported in the inmates institutional record. The occupational prestige scale developed by Robinson et al., (1969) was used to rank these occupations.

Contact with Free Society. The quantity and quality of contact with free society have been proposed as variables which may serve to decrease the impact of confinement. It is suggested that the greater the meaningful contacts with free society, the less the pressures to turn to the inmate group for support, status, prestige, etc. A self-report

response concerning the number of letters received each month and the number of home visits was used to measure this extra-institutional variable. While it is admittedly difficult to measure the quality of contact by use of such indicators as letters and visits, this measure may be justified. First, using the number of letters received rather than the number sent gives an indication of the degree to which the youth has been forgotten by family and friends. Secondly, it is unlikely that one who has been receiving a considerable amount of mail has only received news, etc. of a negative and berating nature. Thirdly, a youth is not allowed a home visit unless his or her parents request it. Thus, it is unlikely that parents would request to see their child if it was felt that the contact would not be beneficial to both parties involved.

Involvement in Criminal Behavior. Wellford (1967) suggests that a greater involvement in a criminalistic subculture prior to incarceration will influence the inmate's assimilation into the inmate normative system. A greater involvement with a subculture of criminals or delinquents should be paralleled by a greater probability of detections, arrest, and conviction. Furthermore, with an increased amount of contact with the social control agencies of society, there is a greater probability that the inmate will enter the institution with certain negative predispositions concerning authority, legitimacy of law, etc. As an operational measure of involvement, the total number of offenses, the number of prior institutionalizations, and the total time the inmate had been committed to the state in his/her lifetime were obtained from the records data.

Priority of Interpersonal Contact. Interpersonal priority is conceptualized as the degree of importance placed upon social relationships with other inmates. A five-item Likert scale was used to measure this variable (Thomas, 1971).

Length of Time Incarcerated and Race. The number of weeks spent at the institution, and the inmate's race were coded from the records data.

Analysis and Findings

Table 1 presents the zero-order relationships for males between all variables used in this study. In summary, the bivariate correlations suggest that race (importation), postrelease expectations (importation), priority of interpersonal contact (deprivation), societal powerlessness (deprivation), and organizational powerlessness (deprivation) are correlates of prisonization. While this is informative it tells us nothing about the overall predictive power of the subset of variables constituting the importation and deprivation models of imprisonment. We now turn to a phase of the analysis that attempts to identify which cluster of variables, and thus which theoretical framework, is an accurate representation of the data from this survey.

// TABLE 1 HERE //

Constructing a multiple regression equation by means of a stepwise solution, wherein any linear combination of variables that was not significant at the .105 level or beyond was dropped from further analysis, we find that only postrelease expectations and race are significant predictors of prisonization. That is, six of the eight importation model variables do not aid us in accounting for the variance in prisonization.

Table 2 provides the summary of the multiple regression. Postrelease expectations accounts for five percent of the variance in the dependent variable ($R^2$ = .051). When race is entered into the regression equation the proportion of variance explained by both variables increases to eight percent ($R^2$ = .079.) An examination of the respective Beta weights notes that the relationships observed are in the predicted direction. While the proportion of variance that is explained by variables in the importation model is certainly not striking, we may conclude that blacks and those who hold negative expectations concerning postrelease adjustment will be the most susceptible to the impact of confinement.

// TABLE 2 HERE //

An examination of Table 3 shows that two of the deprivation model variables used in this analysis emerge as significant. The two alienation variables account for a little over twenty percent of the variance in prisoniztion ($R^2$ = .202). Although the societal powerlessness variable is statistically significant at less than the .05 level, it does not add a great deal to the variance already explained by organizational powerlessness. Organizational powerlessness alone accounts for nineteen percent ($R^2$ = .190).

// TABLE 3 HERE //

Multiple-Partial Analysis

The technique used in this segment of the analysis requires that the variables be entered into the regression equation in such a way that control procedures are facilitated. Use of the multiple-partial correlation coefficient will enable us to see what proportion of the variance in prisonization that is left unaccounted for by one model can be explained by the second. Table 4 presents findings on the question.

// TABLE 4 HERE //

It was determined from the initial regression analysis that postrelease expectations and race were the only statistically significant importation model variables in predicting prisonization. It was also found that the best predictors from the deprivation model were the two alienation variables (organizational powerlessness and societal powerlessness). By first entering the importation model variables into the regression equation and then following this with the deprivation model variables, we will be able to determine what proportion of the variance left unexplained by the importation model may be accounted for by the deprivation model.

Table 4 shows that the two importation model variables account for approximately eight percent of the variance in prisonization ($R^2$ = .079). When the two deprivation model variables are entered into the equation the variance explained is increased to a little over twenty-two percent ($R^2$ = .224). Perhaps the most striking comparison can be seen in the "$R^2$ Change" column. Organizational powerlessness alone increases our predictive ability over and above that accounted for by the two importation model variables by thirteen percentage points ($R^2$ Change = .135). In other words, the one deprivation model variable accounts for more of the variance in prisonization than do both the importation model varibles taken jointly. The multiple-partial coefficient obtained indicates that the deprivation model variables are able to account for a little over fifteen percent of the variance left unexplained by the importation model ($r^2$ = .157).

This multiple-partial analysis has focused upon the relative

predictive power of the deprivation model vis a vis the importation model. We can also look at this problem from the opposite direction. Specifically, after allowing the deprivation model variables to explain all of the variance in the dependent variable that they can, to what extent is our predictive ability enhanced by adding the importation model variables into the regression equation. Table 5 contains the pertinent information for this segment of the analysis.

// TABLE 5 HERE //

An examination of the data shown in Table 5 indicates that organizational powerlessness, societal powerlessness, postrelease expectations, and race account for approximately twenty-two percent of the variance in prisonization ($R^2$ = .224). Closer examination shows, however, that the two deprivation model variables of organizational and societal powerlessness account for nearly all of the total explained variance ($R^2$ = .202). The multiple-partial coefficient shows that the introduction of the importation model into the regression equation increased our prediction by approximately three percent ($r^2$ = .027).

In summary, this segment of the analysis has attempted to ascertain the predictive superiority of two theoretical perspectives, the importation and deprivation models of imprisonment. Tables 4 and 5 clearly show that the deprivation model is the better predictor of prisonization for this one institution. The degree to which inmates are alienated from both the larger society and the correctional institution is a better predictor of prisonization than are the postrelease expectations of the inmate or his race.

## A Convergence of the Importation and Deprivation Models

Table 6 contains the integration of the two models for males. When societal powerlessness, organization powerlessness, postrelease expectations, and race are merged into the same regression equation we find that neither of the sets of variables merges intact as the primary determinant of prisonization. Instead, the variables from both models are intermixed. Thus, the general form of the final regression equation[3] would be as follows:

$$X_1 = .349X_2 + .105X_3 + -.109X_4 + .108X_5$$

Where $X_1$ = prisonization, $X_2$ = organizational powerlessness, $X_3$ = postrelease expectations, $X_4$ = race, and $X_5$ = societal powerlessness.

// TABLE 6 HERE //

To conclude this section, and before moving to the analysis of the female data, one final word seems appropriate. The analysis thus far has pointed out that while in each case one or more deprivation model variables has proven to be the better predictor of prisonization, certain importation model variables are not without significant impact and importance. Thus, a merging of the two models would seem to best fit our attempts to account for the prisonization process. By examination of the Multiple R in Table 6 we see clearly that it is larger than that yielded by either model separately (see Tables 2 and 3). This gives further support to the argument for merging the strengths of both models into a combined predictor set. We will now turn our attention toward the analysis of the female data.

## Analysis for the Female Institution

Table 7 presents the zero-order correlation matrix for the females

yielded by the bivariate analysis. To summarize, it was found that race, total time committed to the state, social class, postrelease expectations, and number of letters received were the importation model variables which correlated with prisonization.

// TABLE 7 HERE //

Deprivation model variables which found support when correlated with prisonization were length of time incarcerated, societal powerlessness, and organizational powerlessness. Also, the correlation between priority of interpersonal contacts and prisonization is interesting. It was predicted that the greater the reliance upon the inmate group for a point of reference, support, status, etc., the greater the prisonization. This is not the case. Just as was the correlation between these same two variables for males, the relationship is actually inverse. That is, greater priority placed upon interpersonal contact within the institution reduces the impact of confinement for females.

As indicated in Table 8, the initial stepwise regression procedure yieldod six significant importation predictors of prisonization. Social class, race, total time ever committed to the state, postrelease expectations, previous institutionalization, and the number of home visits explain approximately twenty-five percent of the variance in prisonization ($R^2$ = .252). The prison experience seems to be particularly salient for females from the lower class, blacks, and those who are not new to the criminal justice machinery. Furthermore, to the extent that they posses negative attitudes concerning their subsequent life-chances after release, and are not able to interact with their families at home while incarcerated also serve as important determinants of the

degree to which the inmate will embrace the normative system of the inmate subculture.

// TABLE 8 HERE //

Table 9 provides the necessary statistical information for the deprivation model. The variables which emerge as significant predictors of prisonization (organizational powerlessness, length of time incarcerated, priority of interpersonal contacts, societal powerlessness) account for approximately thirty-one percent ($R^2$ = .313) of the variance. The Beta weights indicate that all of the relationships are in the predicted direction except for that between priority of interpersonal contact and prisonization. A greater priority placed upon interpersonal contacts within the institution tends to reduce the impact of confinement. In summary, the importation model accounts for approximately twenty-five percent of the variance in prisonization ($R^2$ = .252), while the deprivation model accounts for approximately thirty-one percent of the variance ($R^2$ = .313).

// TABLE 9 HERE //

Multiple-Partial Analysis for Females

This portion of the analysis follows the same line of reasoning as that for the male analysis. The two theoretical models have been examined separately thus far. We must now answer the following question: to what extent is the explained variance increased when we enter a second set of variables into the regression equation? Tables 10 and 11 contain the information necessary to answer this question.

// TABLE 10 HERE //

An examination of Table 10 indicates that the six importation model variables account for approximately twenty-five percent of the variance in prisonization ($R^2$ = .252). The addition of the deprivation variables to the multiple regression equation increases the explained variance to a little over forty-three percent ($R^2$ = .434). The multiple-partial coefficient indicates that the deprivation model variables are able to account for approximately twenty-four percent of the variance left unexplained by the importation model ($r^2$ = .244).

In order to address the same issue but from the opposite direction it is necessary to force all deprivation model variables into the regression equation before allowing the importation variables to enter into the computation. Table 11 indicates the deprivation model alone accounts for thirty-one percent of the variance ($R^2$ = .313) while the addition of the importation model variables into the analysis increases the total variance explained to forty-three percent ($R^2$ = .434). The multiple-partial obtained for this segment of the analysis indicates that the importation model aids in our prediction by approximately eighteen percent over and above that which is explained by the deprivation model alone ($r^2$ = .177).

// TABLE 11 HERE //

In sum, both theoretical models contain variables that appear to be integral to a prediction of prisonization for females. While the multiple-partial analysis does indicate that the deprivation model accounts for more of the variance in normative assimilation than does the importation model, the strength of the importation model cannot be ignored.

When the significant predictors of prisonization from both models are entered into the same regression equation, we find that neither set of variables emerges as a wholly unified group of predictors. The variables from the two models are intermixed. Furthermore, this convergence of the two models indicates that three of the importation model variables which were significant predictors when the model was analyzed separately are now making insignificant contributions to the explained variance. Based upon both the amount of change in the proportion of variance explained and the respective Beta weights, number of home visits, postrelease expectations, and previous institutionalizations drop from the final regression equation.

// TABLE 12 HERE //

On balance, we would propose that females who are from the lower social classes, black, not new to the criminal justice system in general, alienated from both the larger society and the organization, and who have been incarcerated longer are more prone to respond to the impact of confinement by embracing the ten tenets of the inmate normative system. However, the maintenance of ties with other inmates within the institution serves to decrease the impact of confinement for females. The form of the final regression equation obtained from the merger of these two models is as follows:

$$X_1 = .266X_2 + .254X_3 + .187X_4 + .223X_5 + -.200X_6 + -.165X_7 + .111X_8$$

where $X_1$ = prisonization, $X_2$ = organizational powerlessness, $X_3$ = total time ever committed to the state, $X_4$ = race, $X_5$ = societal powerlessness, $X_6$ = interpersonal priorities, $X_7$ + social class, and $X_8$ = length of time incarcerated.

Discussion

Certain variables from the deprivation model emerge that are common to both institutions. Length of time incarcerated, alienation from the organization, and alienation from the general society are significant predictors of the prisonization process. For females, however, the priority placed upon fellow inmates for support, reference group identification, status, etc., seems to reduce the impact of confinement. Juvenile inmates, regardless of sex, are more likely to engage in a negative, and oppositional inmate subculture if they are structurally deprived from effective participation in the system that controls them. To the extent that they are at the bottom of the organizational hierarchy, and feel powerless to control even the most mundane aspects of their lives, inmates will respond in a fashion that is not conducive to formal organizational goals (i.e. take part in the inmate subculture).

Analysis of the importation model also yielded some common variables across sex lines. Race and the quality of the inmate's postrelease expectations serve as common variables. Blacks who have less than positive expectations concerning their probable postrelease adjustment are most vulnerable to the impact of confinement. However, a number of significant variables emerge as predictors of prisonization for females alone. The social class of the female, her prior contact with the criminal justice system, and the ability to maintain close ties with the family while incarcerated seem to also determine her susceptibility to prisonization. The implications of these seemingly disparate findings must be addressed.

To reiterate, while the findings of this research point out certain similarities between the male and female populations, they also point out certain differences between juvenile male and female adaptations to confinement. Specifically, the importation model appears to influence the degree of prisonization for females, while it does not for males. For example, social class, degree of contact with the criminal justice agencies prior to incarceration, and the ability to maintain meaningful ties with family and other supportive members of society while incarcerated, all of which are importation model variables, appear to influence the female's susceptibility to becoming prisonized. Such is not the case for the male inmates. Furthermore, the degree to which inmates are able to create and maintain interpersonal relationships within the institution has a positive effect upon females but no effect at all upon males. Priority of interpersonal contact within the institution seems to insulate the females from the pressures to conform to the inmate normative system. In other words, the greater the priority of interpersonal ties, the less the prisonization. We now offer an attempt to account for these disparities between the two populations.

It has been suggested in prior literature that the degree to which the formal organization exerts coercive control over its charges may be the best predictor of adaptation to confinement. Thus, while neither the male nor the female correctional institution in this study is a treatment-oriented facility, it is probable that the level of coercive control believed to be needed may differ between the two institutions. First, the male institution is over twice as large as the female facility. Thus, for purely logistical purposes the male institution may require

more control in its overall operational goals. Second, the proportion of females that are incarcerated for status offenses far outweighs that for males. Males are oftentimes institutionalized for more serious offenses, offenses had they been adults could have resulted in a prison sentence. This could very well influence organizational staff to believe that the control structure of the male institution must exert more formal and coercive power. Third, the settings of the two institutions were quite different. The male institution was set apart from the city, some thirty miles from any metropolitan area. The female institution was located within city limits. Here, the females were able to leave the "campus" for the day to go shopping with family and friends. Obviously, there was a greater degree of contact with supportive members of society. Such contact has been cited in previous empirical research as a means of mediating the impact of incarceration. Fourth, the lesser degree of coercion in the formal organization's control structure for the female institution may account for the fact that females were able to create and maintain interpersonal ties within the institution. Given a more coercive system, the response may very well be one of individuality, pulling one's time, or, in short, a lack of concern for fellow inmates in either their problems or their pleasures.

On balance, it may be conjectured that to the extent the formal organization strips the inmate of status and reward, preinstitutional and extrainstitutional factors become less salient. Thus, the structurally generated pressures and problems take on a much more meaningful and important place in determining the ways in which inmates will adapt and conform. This would appear to be the case of the institutionalized male

delinquent, at least for the present sample. The institutionalized female, however, given a less coercive structure in which to exist, and while she is responding to the deprivations of imprisonment as well, is better able to view her situation in its entirety. In this way, pre-institutional and extrainstitutional factors remain salient for her, as do the deprivations she encounters.

To conclude, the findings of this research suggest that the deprivation model of imprisonment is the better predictor of prisonization for both sexes, although this is not as clear-cut for females as it is males. Furthermore, the analysis of both sets of data indicate that a more fruitful and comprehensive manner of evaluating the possible determinants of prisonization is to merge the significant variables from the importation and deprivation models into one predictor set. The two theoretical models can and do complement one another. The findings also indicate that, contrary to popular belief, incarcerated female delinquents do adhere to a set of normative prescriptions and proscriptions, and do assimilate into an antisocial inmate subculture. Where there are differences between the male and female populations they concern the particular determinants of the process of prisonization, not necessarily the pattern of adaptation itself.

TABLE 1

CORRELATION MATRIX - MALE

| | | $X_1$ | $X_2$ | $X_3$ | $X_4$ | $X_5$ | $X_6$ | $X_7$ | $X_8$ | $X_9$ | $X_{10}$ | $X_{11}$ | $X_{12}$ | $X_{13}$ | $X_{14}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $X_1$ | Race | 1.000 | .154 | .118 | -.142 | -.082 | .187 | .203 | -.035 | .025 | -.188 | .065 | -.032 | -.055 | -.176 |
| $X_2$ | Total Time Served | | 1.000 | .254 | -.133 | -.483 | -.062 | .100 | .070 | -.039 | -.077 | -.018 | .088 | .281 | .006 |
| $X_3$ | Time at the Institution | | | 1.000 | -.329 | -.122 | .023 | .265 | .027 | -.167 | -.159 | .041 | .311 | -.070 | -.087 |
| $X_4$ | Treatment Approach | | | | 1.000 | .134 | -.059 | -.315 | -.004 | .022 | .144 | -.001 | .054 | .098 | .099 |
| $X_5$ | Previous Institutionalizations | | | | | 1.000 | .064 | -.126 | -.053 | -.030 | .098 | .038 | .049 | -.220 | .044 |
| $X_6$ | Social Class | | | | | | 1.000 | .033 | -.016 | -.059 | -.123 | -.010 | -.116 | -.019 | -.018 |
| $X_7$ | Interpersonal Priorities | | | | | | | 1.000 | -.184 | -.122 | -.297 | -.078 | -.073 | .039 | -.111 |
| $X_8$ | Postrelease Expectations | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .281 | .244 | -.077 | .171 | -.028 | .225 |
| $X_9$ | Societal Powerlessness | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .368 | -.026 | .094 | -.078 | .264 |
| $X_{10}$ | Organizational Powerlessness | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .037 | .040 | -.010 | .436 |
| $X_{11}$ | Letters Reveived | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .173 | -.010 | -.051 |
| $X_{12}$ | Home Visits | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .007 | .004 |
| $X_{13}$ | Previous Offenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .029 |
| $X_{14}$ | Prisonization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.00 |

TABLE 2

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
EMPLOYING IMPORTATION MODEL
VARIABLES FOR MALES

Dependent Variable:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Postrelease Expectations | .225 | .051 | .051 | .210 |
| Race | .281 | .079 | .028 | -.168 |

TABLE 3

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
EMPLOYING DEPRIVATION MODEL
VARIABLES FOR MALES

Dependent Variable:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organization Powerlessness | .435 | .190 | .190 | .391 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .450 | .202 | .012 | .120 |

TABLE 4

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FORCING DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES INTO THE EQUATION AFTER IMPORTATION MODEL VARIABLES FOR MALES

Dependent Variable: Prisonization $r^2 = .157$

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Postrelease Expectations | .225 | .051 | .051 | .105 |
| Race | .281 | .079 | .028 | -.109 |
| Organizational Powerlessness | .463 | .214 | .135 | .349 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .473 | .224 | .009 | .109 |

TABLE 5

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FORCING IMPORTATION MODEL VARIABLES INTO THE EQUATION AFTER DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES FOR MALES

Dependent Variable: Prisonization $r^2 = .027$

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Powerlessness | .435 | .190 | .190 | .349 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .450 | .202 | .012 | .109 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .461 | .212 | .010 | .105 |
| Race | .473 | .224 | .011 | -.109 |

TABLE 6

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS EMPLOYING
IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES
TOGETHER FOR MALES

Dependent Variables:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Powerlessness | .435 | .190 | .190 | .349 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .452 | .205 | .015 | .105 |
| Race | .463 | .214 | .009 | -.109 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .473 | .224 | .010 | .108 |

TABLE 7

CORRELATION MATRIX - FEMALE

| | | $X_1$ | $X_2$ | $X_3$ | $X_4$ | $X_5$ | $X_6$ | $X_7$ | $X_8$ | $X_9$ | $X_{10}$ | $X_{11}$ | $X_{12}$ | $X_{13}$ | $X_{14}$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $X_1$ | Race | 1.000 | -.090 | -.025 | -.028 | .003 | .349 | .014 | .211 | .061 | .035 | .026 | .007 | -.018 | -.240 |
| $X_2$ | Total Time Served | | 1.000 | .592 | -.079 | -.467 | -.003 | -.089 | .259 | -.032 | .062 | -.410 | .206 | .074 | .323 |
| $X_3$ | Time at the institution | | | 1.000 | -.180 | .106 | .014 | -.014 | .148 | -.012 | .035 | -.296 | .311 | -.034 | .283 |
| $X_4$ | Treatment Approach | | | | 1.000 | -.099 | -.037 | -.172 | -.048 | .104 | -.055 | -.084 | -.066 | .079 | -.016 |
| $X_5$ | Previous Institutionalizations | | | | | 1.000 | -.081 | .008 | .259 | .005 | .017 | .193 | .172 | .213 | .046 |
| $X_6$ | Social Class | | | | | | 1.000 | -.037 | .456 | -.018 | -.033 | -.051 | -.022 | .025 | -.225 |
| $X_7$ | Interpersonal Priorities | | | | | | | 1.000 | -.179 | .094 | -.010 | .081 | .052 | -.107 | -.220 |
| $X_8$ | Postrelease Expectations | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .216 | .126 | -.388 | -.058 | -.054 | .196 |
| $X_9$ | Societal Powerlessness | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .359 | -.123 | -.137 | -.012 | .316 |
| $X_{10}$ | Organizational Powerlessness | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .101 | -.126 | .160 | .394 |
| $X_{11}$ | Letters Received | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .021 | .102 | -.158 |
| $X_{12}$ | Home Visits | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | -.125 | -.072 |
| $X_{13}$ | Previous Offenses | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 | .028 |
| $X_{14}$ | Prisonization | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1.000 |

TABLE 8

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
EMPLOYING IMPORTATION MODEL
VARIABLES FOR FEMALES

Dependent Variable:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Ever Served | .323 | .104 | .104 | .387 |
| Social Class | .392 | .154 | .049 | -.196 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .422 | .178 | .024 | .208 |
| Race | .458 | .210 | .031 | -.166 |
| Previous Institutionalizations | .478 | .229 | .019 | .214 |
| Home Visits | .502 | .252 | .023 | -.166 |

TABLE 9

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
EMPLOYING DEPRIVATION MODEL
VARIABLES FOR FEMALES

Dependent Variable:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Powerlessness | .394 | .155 | .155 | .283 |
| Time Served | .467 | .218 | .063 | .259 |
| Interpersonal Priorities | .513 | .263 | .045 | -.236 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .559 | .313 | .050 | .240 |

TABLE 10

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FORCING DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES INTO THE EQUATION AFTER IMPORTATION MODEL VARIABLES FOR FEMALES

Dependent Variable: Prisonization $r^2 = .244$

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Time Ever Served | .323 | .104 | .104 | .254 |
| Social Class | .392 | .154 | .050 | -.165 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .422 | .178 | .024 | .081 |
| Race | .458 | .210 | .031 | -.187 |
| Previous Institutionalizations | .478 | .229 | .019 | .098 |
| Home Visits | .502 | .252 | .023 | -.083 |
| Organizational Powerlessness | .602 | .363 | .111 | .266 |
| Time Served | .604 | .365 | .003 | .111 |
| Interpersonal Priorities | .626 | .392 | .027 | -.200 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .659 | .434 | .042 | .228 |

TABLE 11

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS FORCING IMPORTATION MODEL VARIABLES INTO THE EQUATION AFTER DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES FOR FEMALES

Dependent Variable: Prisonization $r^2 = .177$

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Powerlessness | .394 | .155 | .155 | .266 |
| Time Served | .467 | .218 | .063 | .111 |
| Interpersonal Priorities | .513 | .263 | .045 | -.200 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .559 | .313 | .050 | .228 |
| Total Time Ever Served | .586 | .343 | .030 | .254 |
| Social Class | .625 | .391 | .048 | -.165 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .626 | .392 | .001 | .081 |
| Race | .652 | .426 | .034 | -.137 |
| Previous Institutionalizations | .655 | .429 | .003 | .098 |
| Home Visits | .659 | .434 | .005 | -.083 |

TABLE 12

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS EMPLOYING IMPORTATION AND DEPRIVATION MODEL VARIABLES TOGETHER FOR FEMALES

Dependent Variable:
Prisonization

| | Multiple R | $R^2$ | $R^2$ Change | Beta |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organizational Powerlessness | .394 | .155 | .155 | .266 |
| Total Time Ever Served | .495 | .245 | .039 | .254 |
| Race | .544 | .296 | .052 | -.187 |
| Societal Powerlessness | .586 | .343 | .047 | .228 |
| Interpersonal Priorities | .623 | .388 | .045 | -.200 |
| Social Class | .639 | .408 | .020 | -.165 |
| Time Served | .649 | .421 | .031 | .111 |
| Home Visits | .653 | .426 | .004 | -.083 |
| Postrelease Expectations | .655 | .429 | .003 | .081 |
| Previous Institutionalizations | .659 | .434 | .004 | .098 |

## APPENDIX

## ATTITUDE SCALES

The following is a sample list of all attitude scales employed in this research and each scale item's respective item-to-scale score coefficient.

### PRISONIZATION

| Item Content | Item-to-Scale Score Correlation | |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male |
| The other boys (girls) are right when they say, "Don't do anything more than you have to."* | .596 | .496 |
| It's better to tell the staff what they want to hear than to tell them the truth if you want to get out soon.* | .564 | .564 |

### PRIORITY OF INTERPERSONAL CONTACTS SCALE

| Item Content | Item-to-Scale Score Correlation | |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male |
| I don't really feel close to any of the boys (girls) I've met here. | .729 | .664 |
| Real friends are hard to find here. | .622 | .604 |
| I don't seem to have much in common with the boys (girls) I've met here. | .761 | .676 |

### POST RELEASE EXPECTATIONS SCALE

| Item Content | Item-to-Scale Score Correlation | |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male |
| Nobody at home cares whether I live or die anymore.* | .607 | .440 |
| So many bad things have happened to me that the future doesn't look good for me when I go home.* | .644 | .596 |
| I'm confident that things will be better for me when I leave here. | .479 | .513 |

## SOCIETAL POWERLESSNESS SCALE

| Item Content | Item-to-Scale Score Correlation | |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male |
| People can do almost anything in this country if they work hard enough. | .416 | .519 |
| The average citizen has a good deal of influence on the things that happen to him. | .501 | .406 |
| The world is run by a few people in power and there's not much people like me can do about it.* | .543 | .513 |

## ORGANIZATIONAL POWERLESSNESS SCALE

| Item Content | Item-to-Scale Score Correlation | |
|---|---|---|
| | Female | Male |
| We're allowed to make a lot of decisions for ourselves here. | .595 | .687 |
| None of us have any influence on how we're treated here.* | .649 | .643 |
| There's really not much I can do about what happens to me here.* | .683 | .679 |

* Indicates reversed item scoring.

## NOTES

1. Ward and Kassebaum (1965) and Giallombardo (1966, 1974) suggest that homosexual alliances among the inmates is the predominant mode of adaptation for females. Tittle (1969) argues that primary group formation is more characteristic of female organization than male, but that females also evidence a relatively strong symbiotic structure as well. Heffernan (1972) maintains that there exists three distinct inmate subcultural configurations into which inmates assimilate although she does admit that there does seem to be one overriding normative orientation to which inmates must adapt. Jensen and Jones' (1976) findings are quite similar to those reported in numbrous studies of incarcerated males as to adherence to an identifiable inmate normative system.
2. While a strict interpretation of the importation model would link only preprison experiences to patterns of adaptation while confined it has been argued that such a restricted view overlooks "at least two basic sets of influences: 1) those which exert an immediate effect but which are not direct reflections of the structure of the prison; and 2) the manner in which inmates construct understandings of the kinds of lives they are likely to have, the alternative opportunities that are likely to be open (or closed) to them after their release from prison . . . Thus, a sufficiently inclusive statement of the importation model must place a good deal of importance on the frequency and quality of contacts which inmates maintain with individuals or groups in the larger society during the period of their confinement, the extent to which they feel that they have been so stigmatized by their conviction and confinement that their life-chances have been

adversely affected, . . . (Thomas and Petersen, 1977: 54).

3. The final regression equations reported are for summary and descriptive purposes and are not intended to mislead the reader to believe that this analysis has isolated the effect of individual regressors.

## REFERENCES


Akers, Ronald L., Norman S. Hayner, and Werner Gruninger
1974 "Homosexual and drug behavior in prison: A test of the functional and importation models of the inmate system." Social Problems 21 (Fall): 410-422.

Berk, Bernard B.
1966 "Organizational goals and inmate organization." American Journal of Sociology 71 (March): 522-534.

Clemmer, Donald
1940 The Prison Community. Boston: Christopher Publishing. Reissued, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1958.

1950 "Obersvations on imprisonment as a source of criminality." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 41 (August): 311-319.

Cline, Hugh F.
1968 "The determinants of normative patterns in correctional institutions." Pp. 173-184 in Nils Christie (ed.), Scandinavian Studies in Criminology, 2. Oslo: Oslo University Press.

Cloward, Richard A.
1960 "Social control in the prison." Pp. 20-48 in R. Cloward et al. (eds.), Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Faine, John R.
1973 "A self-consistency approach to prisonization." Sociological Quarterly 14 (Autumn): 576-588.

Garabedian, Peter G.
1963 "Social roles and processes of socialization in the prison community." Social Problems 11 (Fall): 139-152.

1964 "Social roles in a correctional community." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 55 (September): 335-347.

Giallombardo, Rose
1966 Society of Women. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

1974 The Social World of the Imprisoned Girl. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Glaser, Daniel
1964 The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. Indianapolic Bobbs-Merrill.

Grusky, Oscar
1959 "Organizational goals and the behavior of informal leaders." American Journal of Sociology 65 (July): 59-67.

Hayner, Norman S. and Ellis Ash
1940 "The prison as a community." American Sociological Review 5 (August): 577-583.

Heffernan, Ester
1972 Making it in Prison: The Square, the Cool and the Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Irwin, John and Donald Cressey
1962 "Thieves, convicts, and the inmate culture." Social Problems 10 (Fall): 142-155.

Jacobs, James B.
1974 "Street Gangs Behind Bars." Social Problems 21 (Fall): 395-409.

Jensen, Gary F. and Dorothy Jones
1976 "Perspectives on inmate culture: A study of women in prison." Social Forces 54 (March): 590-603.

Mathiesen, Thomas
1971 Across the Boundaries of Organizations. Berkeley: The Glendessary Press.

Neal, Arthur G. and Soloman Rettig
1967 "On the multidimensionality of alienation." American Sociological Review 32 (February): 54-64.

Reimer, Hans
1939 "Socialization in the prison community." Pp. 151-155 in the Proceedings of the American Prison Association, New York: American Prison Association.

Robinson, John P., Robert Athanasiou, and Kendra B. Head
1969 Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Sarri, Rosemary and Robert D. Vinter
1965 "Group treatment strategies in juvenile correctional institutions." Crime and Delinquency 11 (October): 326-340.

Schrag, Clarence
1944 Social Role Types in the Prison Community. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Washington.

1961 "Some foundations for a theory of corrections." Pp. 309-358 in D. Cressey (ed.), The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Schwartz, Barry
1971 "Pre-institutional vs. situational influence in a correctional community." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 62 (September): 532-542.

1973 "Peer versus authority effects in a correctional community." Criminology 11 (August): 233-257.

Street, David A.
1962 Inmate Social Organization: A Comparative Study of Juvenile Correctional Institutions. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan.

1965 "The inmate group in custodial and treatment settings." American Sociological Review 30 (February): 40-55.

Street, David A., Robert D. Vinter and Charles Perrow
1966 Organization for Treatment. New York: Free Press.

Sykes, Gresham M.
1958 The Society of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sykes, Gresham M. and Sheldon L. Messinger
1960 "The inmate social system." Pp. 5-19 in R. Cloward et al. (eds.), Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Thomas, Charles W.
1970 "Toward a more inclusive model of the inmate contraculture." Criminology 8 (November): 251-262.

Thoams, Charles W.
1971 Determinants of Prisonization: A Test of Two Analytical Perspectives on Adult Resocialization in Total Institutions. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky.

1973 "Prisonization or resocialization? A study of external factors associated with the impact of confinement." Journal or Research in time and Delinquency 10 (January): 13-21.

1977 "Theoretical Perspectives on Prisonization: A Comparison of the Importation and Deprivation Models." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, in press.

Thomas, Charles W. and David M. Petersen
1977 Prison Organization and Inmate Subcultures. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Thomas, Charles W. and Eric D. Poole
1975 "The consequences of incompatible goal structures in correctional settings." International Journal of Criminology and Penology 3: 27-42.

Thomas, Charles W. and Matthew T. Zingraff
1976 "Organizational structure as a determinant of prisonization." Pacific Sociological Review 19 (January): 98-116.

Tittle, Charles R.
1969 "Inmate organization: Sex differentiation and the influence of criminal subcultures." American Sociological Review 34 (August): 492-505.

1972a Society of Subordinates. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

1972b "Institutional living and self-esteem." Social Problems 20 (Summer):

Tittle, Charles R. and Drollene P. Tittle
1964 "Social organization of prisoners: An empirical test." Social Forces 43 (December): 216-221.

Ward, David A. and Gene Kassebaum
1965 Women's Prison: Sex and Social Structure. Chicago: Aldine.

Wellford, Charles F.
1967 "Factors associated with adoption of the inmate code." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science 58 (June): 197-203.

Wheeler, Stanton
1961 "Socialization in correctional communities." American Sociological review 26 (October): 697-712.

Zald, Mayer N.
1960 "The correctional institution for juvenile offenders: An analysis of organizational character." Social Problems 8 (Summer): 57-67.

1962 "Organizational control structures in five correctional institutions." American Journal of Sociology 68 (November: 335-345.

Zald, Mayer N. and David A. Street
1964 "Custody and treatment of juvenile institutions: An organizational analysis." Crime and Delinquency 10 (July): 249-256.

Zingraff, Matthew T.
1973 "Conflicting processes of socialization among juveniles in the prison community." Georgia Journal of Corrections 2 (August): 63-70.

1975 "Prisonization as an inhibitor of effective resocialization." Criminology 13 (November): 336-388.

1976 "The inmate subculture and adaptation patterns of incarcerated female delinquents." Paper presented to the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York.